



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/509,177

09/27/2004

Akinori Koukitsu

121213

5228

25944 7590 11/12/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

SONG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/509,177	Applicant(s) KOUKITSU ET AL.	
	Examiner MATTHEW J. SONG	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 12, 13 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 12, 13 and 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1, 3, 18-19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikolaev et al (US 6,218,269) in view of Benander et al (US 4,698,244).

In a method of forming III-V compounds, note entire reference, Nikolaev et al teaches reacting Al metal with HCl at a temperature of 350-800 °C, this clearly suggests applicant's solid Al because Al metal is solid at temperature below 660 °C, to produce a halogenated product of Al, aluminum trichloride (col 7, ln 50 to col 8, ln 20). Overlapping ranges are held to be prima facie obvious (MPEP 2144.05). Nikolaev et al also teaches forming a III-V compound by reacting aluminum trichloride with ammonia to form AlGaN (col 8, ln 1-25). Nikolaev et al

Art Unit: 1792

teaches a quartz reactor. (col 7, ln 50-65). Nikolaev et al also teaches Al reacting with HCl in a source zone and aluminum trichloride reacting with ammonia in the growth zone, this clearly suggests a first reaction in a first zone and a second reaction in a second zone.

Nikolaev et al teaches reacting Al metal with HCl at a temperature of 350-800 °C, this clearly suggests applicant's solid Al because Al metal is solid at temperature from 300°C-650°C, to produce a halogenated product of Al, aluminum trichloride (col 7, ln 50 to col 8, ln 20). Overlapping ranges are held to be prima facie obvious (MPEP 2144.05). Furthermore, Benander et al teaches forming aluminum trichloride by reacting aluminum metal with HCl at a temperature of 500°C. (col 5, ln 65 to col 6, ln 15 and col 3, ln 20-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nikolaev et al by using a temperature of 500°C, as taught by Benander et al, because 500°C is known in the art to be a sufficient temperature to produce aluminum trichloride.

Referring to claims 3 and 23, Nikolaev et al teaches HCl.

Referring to claim 18, Nikolaev et al teaches reacting with ammonia.

Referring to claim 19, Nikolaev et al teaches a temperature of 800-1200°C (col 8, ln 1-20), which is completely within the claimed range. Nikolaev et al also teaches growth at 1100°C. (col 10, ln 1-65).

3. Claims 4, 6, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikolaev et al (US 6,218,269) in view of Benander et al (US 4,698,244) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Shibata et al (EP 184488 A2) and Vaudo et al (US 6,533,874).

Art Unit: 1792

The combination of Nikolaev et al and Benander et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 4, as discussed previously, except at least one of the amount of the halogenated hydrogen used; the amount of a carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen; and the amount of the group V element containing gas is varied to deposit a III-V group compound semiconductors having different composition. The combination of Nikolaev et al and Benander et al teaches AlGaIn layers forming pn junctions may have different AlN concentrations for different layers (col 7, ln 10-45).

In a method of HVPE, note entire reference, Shibata et al teaches HCl is introduced with H₂ carrier gas and reacted with metallic aluminum to form AlCl gas ([0034]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention the combination of Nikolaev et al and Benander et al by using a carrier gas for HCl, as taught by Shibata et al, because carrier gases are known in the art to provide a smooth of reaction gases into the deposition chamber, as evidenced by Kang et al (US 6,197,683) in column 6, lines 15-25.

The combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al and Shibata et al does not teach the amount of a carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen is varied to deposit a III-V group compound semiconductors having different composition.

In a method of HVPE, note entire reference, Vaudo et al teaches the composition of (Ga,Al,In)N is controlled by the flow of HCl over each metal as well as by the substrate temperature and by the temperature of each metal (col 11, ln 10-60), this clearly suggests varying the amount and the amount of carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen gas because the flow of HCl is dependant on the flow carrier gas.

Art Unit: 1792

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to modify the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al and Shibata et al by varying the HCl amount or amount of carrier gas, as suggested by Vaudo et al, to produce useful graded layers or pn junctions.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al, Shibata et al, and Vaudo et al teach HCl and H₂ ('488 Fig 4).

Referring to claim 21, the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al, Shibata et al, and Vaudo et al teaches a temperature of 800-1200°C ('269 col 8, ln 1-20), which is completely within the claimed range. Nikolaev et al also teaches growth at 1100°C. ('269 col 10, ln 1-65).

4. Claims 2, 12, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikolaev et al (US 6,218,269) in view of Benander et al (US 4,698,244) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Solomon et al (WO 00/68470 A1) from IDS.

The combination of Nikolaev et al and Benander et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 2, as discussed previously, except reacting a solid mixture of group III metals including Al.

In a HVPE method, note entire reference, Solomon et al teaches reacting a group III metal with HCl, where the Group III metal is Ga, In, or Al or alloys thereof (pg 11, ln 1-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to modify the combination of Nikolaev et al and Benander et al by using a mixture of Group III metals, which include Al, as taught by Solomon et al because a combination of known material suitable of its intended purpose is held to be obvious (MPEP 2144.07) and because an alloy of Group III metals can produce a ternary compound with a single source.

Art Unit: 1792

Referring to claim 12, Nikolaev et al teaches HCl.

Referring to claim 20, Nikolaev et al teaches a temperature of 800-1200°C ('269 col 8, ln 1-20), which is completely within the claimed range. Nikolaev et al also teaches growth at 1100°C. ('269 col 10, ln 1-65).

5. Claims 5, 13, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nikolaev et al (US 6,218,269), Benander et al (US 4,698,244) and Solomon et al (WO 00/68470 A1) from IDS, as applied to claims 2 and 12 above, and further in view of Shibata et al (EP 184488 A2) from IDS and Vaudo et al (US 6,533,874).

The combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al and Solomon et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 5, as discussed previously, except at least one of the amount of the halogenated hydrogen used; the amount of a carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen; and the amount of the group V element containing gas is varied to deposit a III-V group compound semiconductors having different composition. Nikolaev et al teaches AlGaN layers forming pn junctions may have different AlN concentrations for different layers (col 7, ln 10-45).

In a method of HVPE, note entire reference, Shibata et al teaches HCl is introduced with H₂ carrier gas and reacted with metallic aluminum to form AlCl gas ([0034]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to modify the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al and Solomon et al by using a carrier gas for HCl, as taught by Shibata et al, because carrier gases are known in the art to provide a smooth of reaction gases into the deposition chamber, as evidenced by Kang et al (US 6,197,683) in column 6, lines 15-25.

Art Unit: 1792

The combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al, Solomon et al and Shibata et al does not teach the amount of a carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen is varied to deposit a III-V group compound semiconductors having different composition.

In a method of HVPE, note entire reference, Vaudo et al teaches the composition of (Ga,Al,In)N is controlled by the flow of HCl over each metal as well as by the substrate temperature and by the temperature of each metal (col 11, ln 10-60), this clearly suggests varying the amount and the amount of carrier gas for the halogenated hydrogen gas because the flow of HCl is dependant on the flow carrier gas.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to modify the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al, Solomon et al and Shibata et al by varying the HCl amount or amount of carrier gas, as suggested by Vaudo et al, to produce useful graded layers or pn junctions.

Referring to claim 13, the combination of Nikolaev et al, Benander et al, Solomon et al, Shibata et al, and Vaudo et al teach HCl and H₂ ('488 Fig 4).

Referring to claim 22, Nikolaev et al teaches a temperature of 800-1200°C ('269 col 8, ln 1-20), which is completely within the claimed range. Nikolaev et al also teaches growth at 1100°C. ('269 col 10, ln 1-65).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/6/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1792

Applicant's argument that the declaration shows unexpected results is noted but is not found persuasive. The declaration fails to show the claimed temperature range is critical to producing unexpected results. First, the declaration merely compares 650°C and 850°C. The declaration fails to compare the closest prior art, Nikolaev et al, which teaches a temperature range of 350°C-800°C. Second, the declaration fails to show the criticality of 650°C. The declaration clearly suggests that similar results can be obtained at 700°C; therefore the claimed range is not critical to producing unexpected results. Also, the figures 1 and 2 fails to show any criticality at 650°C. Applicant has failed to rebut the prima facie case of obviousness for overlapping ranges; therefore the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1792

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. SONG whose telephone number is (571)272-1468. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Kornakov can be reached on 571-272-1303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew J Song
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

MJS
November 8, 2008

/Robert M Kunemund/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792